

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

KENNETH AND PAMELA PRICE JEAN *
Plaintiffs *

v. *

CITY OF ASHBURNHAM POLICE *
DEPARTMENT, CITY OF WINCENDON *
POLICE DEPARTMENT, ROB HARRINGTON, *
in his capacity as CHIEF OF THE WINCENDON * C.A. NO. 03-12306MLW
POLICE DEPARTMENT, JACK MURRAY, in his *
capacity as CHIEF OF THE ASHBURNHAM *
POLICE DEPARTMENT, TODD C. PARSONS *
RAYMOND M. ANAIR, ROBERT BRENNON, *
WILLIAM P. GEOFFROY, BRIAN HART, *
KEVIN AHEARN, KEVIN E. WOLSKI *
OFFICER JOHN DOE, OFFICER JOHN POE. *
Defendants *

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Plaintiffs Pamela Jean and Kenneth Jean move for reconsideration of the Order of the Court of June 16, 2006. In support they say the following:

1. It appears that the Court based its decision upon review of the Third Amended Complaint rather than the Substitute Third Amended Complaint, which the Court erroneously said had not been filed, but, in fact, was filed [see Docket # 65].
2. The Substitute Third Amended Complaint was prepared and filed by Plaintiffs to accommodate multiple criticisms from the Defendants and, in fact, addressed the points

the Court said the Plaintiffs had failed to address, including, among others, Plaintiffs' naming Officer Gushlaw as a Defendant.¹

3. The Court also admonishes the Plaintiffs for failing to name Officer Baranowski after being allowed by Order of the Court to add him as a Defendant. The Plaintiffs' omission in this regard resulted from a misunderstanding. Plaintiffs's Counsel was, in the absence of the Court's having issued any written order or made any docket notation to this effect, uncertain as to what ruling the Court had made, after conferring on this matter, as they were directed to do, with defense counsel. After conferring with one of the Defense Counsel, Plaintiffs mistakenly believed the Court had denied them leave to amend the Complaint to add Officer Baranowski.
4. The inclusion of the names of defendants Geoffrey and Wolski in Count XII, alleging defamation for identifying Ms. Jean's occupation as "prostitute" in the booking sheet for her arrest, was not done to circumvent any order of the Court, but was intended to satisfy repeated requests of the Defendants that the Plaintiffs accurately identify which Defendants were the subject of Count XII.²

For the above reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to review the Substitute Third Amended Complaint, Docket # 65, apparently overlooked by the Court, and based upon such review, reconsider its Memorandum and Order, and allow plaintiffs' Substitute Third Amended Complaint.

¹ Officer Gushlaw's name is dropped from the Substitute Third Amended Complaint. Indeed, this was one reason for substituting a corrected complaint, as noted at the top of page 3 of the Motion to Allow filing of Substitute Third Amended Complaint.

² The substitution of defendants Geoffrey and Wolski for Defendant Brennan is also reflected in the Substitute Third Amended Complaint.

Date: June 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
Pamela Price Jean,
by her counsel,

/s/ Mark D. Stern
Mark D. Stern
BBO # 4795000
MARK D. STERN, P.C.
34 Liberty Avenue
Somerville, MA 02144
(617) 776 4020
Fax (617) 776 9250
markdsternpc@rcn.com

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth Jean,
by his counsel,

/s/ Andrew M. Fischer
Andrew Fischer
BBO # 167040
Jason and Fischer
47 Winter Street
Boston MA 02108
617-423-7904
afischer@jasonandfischer.com